## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 26-53 were pending in the application, of which Claims 26, 34, 38, 42, and 43 are independent. In the Office Action dated July 26, 2005, Claims 26-53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Following this response, Claims 26-53 remain in this application. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

### I.    Change to Attorney Docket Number

Please note that the Attorney Docket Number for this application is now **14917.0235US01/MS136631.01**.

### II.    Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action dated July 26, 2005, the Examiner rejected Claims 26-53 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Adobe® FrameMaker®+SGML integrated XML authoring and composition tool as disclosed by "Adobe® FrameMaker®+SGML 5.5: Developing SGML Publishing Applications," 1997 (hereinafter "*AFM97*") and Charles F. Goldfarb and Paul Prescod, "The XML Handbooks," 1998 (hereinafter "*Goldfarb and Prescod*"), pp. 278-295, in view of Elliotte Rusty Harold, "XML Bible," 1999, IDG Books Worldwide, Inc. (art of record; hereinafter "*Harold*"). Claims 26, 34, 38, 42, and 43 have been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

Amended Claim 26 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "the precedence order of default values comprising first using an attribute value associated with a previous occurrence of a tag in a tree if the tag is not provided with an overriding attribute, then using a default attribute value if no previous occurrence of the tag is present in the tree." Amended Claims 34, 38, 42, and 43 each include a similar recitation.

In contrast, and as stated by the Examiner, *AFM97* and *Goldfarb* at least do not teach or suggest a plurality of resource tag attribute default value mechanisms whose order corresponds to a precedence order of default values for the attributes. (*See* Office Action page 4, lines 15-17, and page 10, lines 6-9.) Accordingly, Applicants submit that because *AFM97* and *Goldfarb* do not suggest or disclose a precedence order of default values for the attributes, these references do not suggest or disclose the precedence order of default values comprising first using an attribute value associated with a previous occurrence of a tag in a tree if the tag is not provided with an overriding attribute, then using a default attribute value if no previous occurrence of the tag is present in the tree.

Furthermore, *Harold* does not overcome *AFM97's* and *Goldfarb's* deficiencies. *Harold* merely discloses, if there is not a rule that specifies a font size of an element, then the element inherits the font size of its parent. (*See Harold*, page 334, lines 5-6.) One way to avoid problems created by this inheritance while retaining some control over the size of individual elements is to use relative units like "ems" and "ex's" instead of absolute units like points, picas, inches, centimeters, and millimeters. (*See Harold*, page 335, lines 5-7.) An "em" is the width of the letter *m* in the current font. (*See*

*Harold*, page 335, lines 7-8.) An "ex" is the height of the letter *x* in the current font. (*See Harold*, page 335, 8-9.) If the font gets bigger, so does everything measured in "ems" and "ex's." (*See Harold*, page 335, line 9.) Furthermore, *Harold* discloses that a similar option for some properties is to use percentage units. (*See Harold*, page 335, line 9.) Like *AFM97* and *Goldfarb*, *Harold* at least does not teach or suggest first using an attribute value associated with a previous occurrence of a tag in a tree, if the tag is not provided with an overriding attribute, and then using a default attribute value if no previous occurrence of the tag is present in the tree. Rather, *Harold* merely discloses using relative units instead of absolute units or using percentage units.

Combining *AFM97*, *Goldfarb*, and *Harold* would not have led to the claimed invention because *AFM97*, *Goldfarb*, and *Harold,* either individually or in any reasonable combination, at least do not disclose or suggest "the precedence order of default values comprising first using an attribute value associated with a previous occurrence of a tag in a tree if the tag is not provided with an overriding attribute, then using a default attribute value if no previous occurrence of the tag is present in the tree", as recited by amended Claim 26. Amended Claims 34, 38, 42, and 43 each include a similar recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 26, 34, 38, 42, and 43 each patentably distinguish the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 26, 34, 38, 42, and 43.

Dependent Claims 27-33, 35-37, 39-41, and 44-53 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 26, 34, 38, and 43, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 26, 34, 38, and 43.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 27-33, 35-37, 39-41, and 44-53.

### III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Office Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge

any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 10, 2005          By:_____

D. Kent Stier
Reg. No. 50,640

Merchant & Gould
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-9946
Telephone: 404.954.5066

**27488**
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

DKS:mdb